



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/721,735

11/25/2003

Seung Hoon Kim

10125/4127

3288

7590

11/25/2005

Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione
Post Office Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER

CALEY, MICHAEL H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

11A

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/721,735		KIM, SEUNG HOON	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Michael H. Caley		2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 and 18-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah (U.S. Patent No. 5,262,880) in view of Fujishiro et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,693,682 "Fujishiro").

Regarding claim 1, Abileah discloses an LCD device comprising:

an LCD panel (Figure 1A element DISPLAY, Figure 1 element 6) for displaying an image;

a plurality of fluorescent lamps (Figure 1 element 2, Figure 1A element LAMP, Figure 6; Column 13 lines 1-27);

a heat protection plate (Figure 1 element 5 or IRF or 4 or combination thereof, Figure 1A element DIFFUSER or IR FILTER or I.S.D. or combination thereof) formed between the LCD panel and the fluorescent lamp; and,

a first open area (Figure 1A element AIR GAP #3) between the heat protection plate and the LCD panel.

Abileah fails to explicitly disclose a case supporting the plurality of fluorescent lamps, the heat protection plate and the reflecting plate, wherein the heat protection plate is disposed in the case. Fujishiro, however, teaches a case supporting the light source elements (Figures 5A and 7A elements 31, 32, and 33) in which a heat protection plate (element 5) is disposed in the case.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed a case to support the light source elements for the display device disclosed by Abileah. One would have been motivated to form such a casing to benefit from its conventionally known advantages such as its ability to provide positional alignment between the various light source and display components and to protect the components from environmental hazards such as shock.

Regarding claim 2, Abileah discloses the heat protection plate as comprising at least one of a diffusion plate and an optical sheet (Figure 1A element DIFFUSER, Figure 1 element 5).

Regarding claim 3, Abileah discloses the heat protection plate as having a light transmitting plate (Figure 1 element IRF, Figure 1A elements IR FILTER).

Regarding claim 4, Abileah discloses a reflecting plate disposed to reflect light from the fluorescent lamps to the LCD panel (Figure 1 element 3, Figure 1A element REFLECTOR PLATE).

Regarding claim 6, Abileah fails to disclose the reflecting plate as formed on the case. Fujishiro, however, teaches the reflecting plate as formed on the case (Figure 7 element 43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the reflecting plate on the case in the display device disclosed by Abileah. One would have been motivated to form the reflecting plate on the case so that reflector may surround and cover the entire back side of the fluorescent lamps while being precisely positioned in its predetermined position relative to the lamps according to the teachings of Fujishiro.

Regarding claim 7, Abileah discloses the reflecting plate as having a high optical reflectivity material containing at least one of silver, titanium, and a polymer (Column 12 lines 28-33).

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Abileah fails to disclose the case as having a high heat conductivity material. Fujishiro, however, teaches a high heat conductivity aluminum as the material for the case as a means of maintaining a lower temperature of the display unit and a lower weight of the display (Column 1 line 59 – Column 2 line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have constructed the case to comprise a high heat conductivity material such as aluminum. One would have been motivated to incorporate such a material into the case as a means of maintaining a lower display temperature and thus a higher display quality (Column 1 lines 38-45).

Art Unit: 2871

Regarding claim 10, Abileah discloses a second open area disposed between the heat protection plate and the plurality of fluorescent lamps (Figure 1A element AIR GAP #1).

Regarding claims 11-14, Abileah discloses a plurality of heat protection panels, and a third open area as disposed between at each of the plurality of heat protection panels (Figure 1A element AIR GAP #2).

Regarding claims 15, 16, 19, and 20, Abileah discloses a means for scattering light disposed between the LCD panel and the plurality of fluorescent lamps (Figure 1A element DIFFUSER).

Regarding claim 21, Abileah discloses a second open area disposed between the heat protection plate and the plurality of fluorescent lamps (Figure 1A element AIR GAP #1).

Regarding claim 22, Abileah discloses a first diffusion plate (Figure 6 element 204) and a first optical sheet (Figure 6 element 202b) disposed between the LCD panel and the plurality of fluorescent lamps;

a heat protection plate (Figure 6 element IRF or alternatively 202a or combination thereof) between the LCD panel and the plurality of fluorescent lamps; and,

a first open area disposed between the heat protection plate and the LCD panel (Figure 1A element AIR GAP #1 or AIR GAP #2).

Art Unit: 2871

Regarding claim 23, Abileah discloses the heat protection plate as having at least one of a second diffusion plate and a second optical sheet (Figure 6 element 202a).

Regarding claim 24, Abileah discloses the heat protection plate as having a light transmitting plate (Figure 6 element IRF).

Regarding claims 25 and 28, Abileah discloses a reflecting plate as disposed to reflect light from the fluorescent lamps to the LCD panel (Figure 6 element 298).

Regarding claim 26, Abileah discloses the reflecting plate as having a high optical reflectivity material containing at least one of silver, titanium, and a polymer (Column 12 lines 28-33).

Regarding claim 31, Abileah discloses a second open area as disposed between the heat protection plate and the fluorescent lamps (Figure 1A element AIR GAP #1).

Regarding claim 32-35, Abileah discloses a plurality of heat protection panels, and a third open area as disposed between each of the plurality of heat protection panels (Figure 1A element AIR GAP #2).

Regarding claims 36-38, Abileah discloses the heat protection plate as comprising a light scattering means (Figure 1A element DIFFUSER, Figure 1 element 5). Abileah fails to disclose

Art Unit: 2871

details concerning the connection of the heat protection plate and a case. Fujishiro, however, teaches a heat protection plate/light scattering means as connected to a case (Figures 5 and 7 elements 5, 31, and 32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect the heat protection plate/light scattering means to a case in the display device disclosed by Abileah. One would have been motivated to connect the heat protection plate to the case such to provide and maintain positional alignment between the light source and the heat protection plate.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abileah in view of Fujishiro and in further view of Kanatsu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,857,825 “Kanatsu”).

Abileah as modified by Fujishiro discloses all of the proposed limitations except for the light-reflecting means as having a high optical reflectivity material coated on a high heat conductivity material. Kanatsu, however, teaches such a reflector as a means of efficiently radiating heat from the lamps (Column 8 line 62 – Column 9 line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have constructed the reflector to comprise a high heat conductivity material such as aluminum. One would have been motivated to incorporate such a material into the case as a means of maintaining a lower display temperature and thus a higher display quality (Fujishiro, Column 1 lines 38-45).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/16/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the rejection of claims 1, 15, and 22, Applicant contends that the combination of the front, center, and rear shields (31, 32, and 33) of Fujishiro (Figure 5A) do not constitute a case. Fujishiro, however, discloses the structure of shields 31, 32, and 33 as “constituting a body of the liquid crystal display” having the panel and light source built in them. Given that the elements 31, 32 and 33 serve as an outer covering for the panel and light source, the examiner holds that it is reasonable to identify these elements as a case.

Applicant further contends that the motivation for combining Abileah and Fujishiro is not consistent with the disclosure of Fujishiro due to the presence of penetration holes through which dust may enter. The examiner maintains that other reasons for motivation presented and not addressed by Applicant, such as serving as a means for positioning the display elements and as a means for protection against environmental hazards, remain valid.

Applicant further contends that neither Abileah nor Fujishiro suggest an arrangement in which the heat protection plate is disposed in the case. Abileah, however, discloses the heat protection plate as placed between the lighting unit and the display panel (Figure 1). Fujishiro teaches both the display panel and the lighting unit as placed within the case (Column 8 lines 56-61; Figure 5A). Furthermore, Fujishiro shows elements intermediate between the light source and the display panel as also placed within the case (Figure 5A).

Art Unit: 2871

Regarding the rejection of claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 29, and 30, the examiner acknowledges that the teaching relied upon in Fujishiro regarding a high heat conductivity material for the case is presented in the background of the invention. The examiner maintains, however, that this teaching may be validly combined with the case taught by Fujishiro and the display device disclosed by Abileah due to its advantageous heat conduction and lightweight properties. Furthermore, Fujishiro does not suggest another material or teach away from the material presented in the background of the invention. Accordingly, it may be presumed that Fujishiro intended to maintain aluminum as a desirable case material for the disclosed invention due to its heat conduction and lightweight properties. Fujishiro provides sufficient disclosure of the shield structure such that one skilled in the art may construct it from an aluminum material and is thus deemed to be enabled.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2871

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael H. Caley whose telephone number is (571) 272-2286. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (571) 272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael H. Caley
November 21, 2005


mhc


ANDREW SCHECHTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER